

Harvard-Yenching Institute

On The Titles Given in Juvainī to Certain Mongolian Princes

Author(s): John A. Boyle

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 1/2 (Jun., 1956), pp. 146-154

Published by: [Harvard-Yenching Institute](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2718493>

Accessed: 09/03/2013 16:46

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Harvard-Yenching Institute is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ON THE TITLES GIVEN IN JUVAINĪ TO CERTAIN MONGOLIAN PRINCES

JOHN A. BOYLE
UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

1. *Uluγ-Noyan*

Tolui, the youngest son of Čingiz-Xan by his chief wife Börte Fuĵin, is referred to in the *Ta'riḫ-i-Ĵahān-Guṣā* of Ĵuvainī sometimes by his own name (in the form *Toli* تولى) but more frequently by what appears to be a title, viz., *Uluγ-Noyan*, “the great *noyan*,” from the Turkish *uluγ* “great” and the Mongolian *noyan*. Rašīd-ad-Dīn usually calls him by his name but sometimes¹ refers to him as *Yeke-Noyan*, which is of course the purely Mongolian equivalent of *Uluγ-Noyan* with *yeke* substituted for *uluγ*. He states, moreover, in several places that Tolui was also called *Yeke-Noyan* or *Uluγ-Noyan* and even specifically describes this appellation as his title (*laqab*).² This would appear at first sight to be an adequate explanation of the matter; the only difficulty is that according to Ĵuvainī the Mongolian princes were not given titles. “When one of them ascends the throne of the Khanate he receives one additional name, that of *Khan* or *Qa'an*, than which nothing more is written [in official documents]; while the other sons³ and his brothers are addressed by the name they were given at birth, both in their presence and in their absence . . .”⁴ *Uluγ-Noyan* cannot therefore have been a title in the ordinary sense, and in fact Rašīd-ad-Dīn himself provides the clue to what appears to be its real nature.

¹ I. N. BEREZIN, “Sbornik letopisei. Istoriya Mongolov sočinenie Rašid-Eddina,” *Trudy Vostočnago Otdeleniya Imperatorskago Russkago Arkheologičeskago Obščestva*, Volumes 5, 7, 13, and 15. Cf. 7.148; 15.215, 235, and 228.

² *Ibid.*, 13.126; 15.33, 79, and 111; E. BLOCHET, *Djami el-Tévarikh, Histoire générale du monde par Fadl Allah Rashid ed-Din*, Tome II (Leyden-London, 1911), p. 199.

³ The Persian *pisar* “son” is used here, like the Mongolian *köbe'ün*, in the sense of “prince of the blood.” Cf. Ĵuvainī, II, ix; also B. Vladimirtsov, *Le régime social des Mongols*, Paris, 1948, p. 127, and Paul PELLIOU, *Les Mongols et la Papauté*, p. [168].

⁴ Ĵuvainī, I, p. 19.

When Tolui died, so Rašīd-ad-Dīn informs us, the word *toli* "mirror" was declared taboo (*nām-i-γoruq*) and the Mongols substituted the Turkish synonym *közü*, which they still continued to use in Rašīd-ad-Dīn's day in place of the native Mongolian word.⁵ What in fact Rašīd-ad-Dīn is describing is the application of "the widespread rule which forbids the living to mention the dead for a longer or shorter period after their death, lest the ghost of the deceased should hear and answer to his name."⁶ In accordance with this principle certain tribes in Madagascar are "forbidden under the gravest penalties to use in current language words which form parts of the names of dead kings, or have a similar sound, such words being replaced by synonyms created for the purpose."⁷ And from Tanganyika FRAZER provides us with an exact analogy of the case of Tolui and the word for "mirror." "Another son of king Kisabo [of the Barundi, a Bantu tribe] was named Mafjuguru which means *spear*. After his death the name for spear was changed from *mafjuguru* to *itschumu*."⁸

That this practice obtained amongst the Mongols is explicitly stated by Carpini,⁹ and he even supplies us with indirect evidence as to its application in the case of Tolui. In enumerating the sons of Čingiz-Xan he says that he does not know the name of the fourth;¹⁰ a little further on he refers to the father of Möngke and Böček¹¹ as "the other son of Chingischān, whose name we do not

⁵ BEREZIN, 13.126.

⁶ Sir James G. FRAZER, *The Fear of the Dead in Primitive Religion* (London, 1933-1936), III, p. 42.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

⁹ ". . . nec nomen proprium eius [*sc. mortui*] usque ad terciam generationem audet aliquis nominare." Anastasius VAN DEN WYNGAERT, *Sinica Franciscana*, Vol. I (Florence, 1929), p. 43.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

¹¹ *Bichac* or *Bechac*. The *Büjg* of the *Secret History* (§277) and *Böčök* of the *Yüan shih* (Louis HAMBIS, *Le chapitre cvii du Yuan che*, p. 89). Böček was actually Möngke's half-brother. Cf. BLOCHET, *op. cit.*, p. 207, where there is a blank for his mother's name. He had taken part in the expedition against Eastern Europe (cf. Juvaini I, p. 224; BLOCHET, *op. cit.*, p. 43; and Vladimir MINORSKY, "Caucasica III: The Alān Capital Magas and the Mongol Campaigns," *BSOAS* 14 (1952).222, 224, and 231, n. 23) and must be the brother of Möngke and Ariγ Böke, "by the father," wh

know.”¹² That Carpini, whose information is so full and accurate and who gives the names of two of Tolui’s sons and also that of his wife,¹³ should have been ignorant of the prince’s own name is explicable only by assuming that at the time of his visit to Mongolia the taboo on its mention was still strictly observed.

But, if Tolui’s name might not be pronounced, how was it possible to make reference to the dead prince? This, I suggest, was the purpose of *Uluγ-Noyan*: it was not an honour conferred during his lifetime but a posthumous title adopted solely in order to avoid the mention of his name. The conqueror of Merv and Nishapur, who had subsequently led the Mongols to victory in China, was aptly described as *Uluγ-Noyan*, the “Great Captain.”

2. *Uluš-Idi*

It would be strange if *Uluγ-Noyan* were the only recorded instance of such a posthumous title, and I would suggest that we have another example in *Uluš-Idi* (الوش ایدی or الش ایدی), the name, according to Ĵuvainī, of the Mongolian general who led the expedition down the Syr Darya against Ĵand.

Uluš-Idi is mentioned only in the chapter¹⁴ on this expedition and in the corresponding chapter¹⁵ of Rašīd-ad-Dīn, where he is called *Ulus-Idi* الوستیدی. BEREZIN identified him with the *idī-qut*, the ruler of the Uiγur, who, however, according to Ĵuvainī,¹⁷ took part in an expedition in an entirely different direction, into the region of the Upper Oxus. The historian BARTHOLD,¹⁸ who re-

according to Rubruck had captured the Parisian goldsmith William BUCHIER “in Hungary, in a town called Belgrade.” Cf. VAN DEN WYNGAERT, *op. cit.*, p. 287, and W. W. ROCKHILL, *The Journey of William of Rubruck to the Eastern Parts of the World, 1253-55, as Narrated by Himself* (London, 1900), p. 222.

¹² VAN DEN WYNGAERT, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

¹³ *Ibid.* Seroccan, i. e., *Soroctan < Soryoqtani. Cf. Paul PELLLOT, “Le vrai nom de ,Serocctan ,” *TP* 29 (1932).43-54. On the spelling of the name in Ĵuvainī, see note 38 below.

¹⁴ I, pp. 66-70.

¹⁵ BEREZIN, 15.68-72.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 171.

¹⁷ I, p. 33.

¹⁸ W. BARTHOLD, *Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion* (London, 1928), p. 416, note 1. BARTHOLD’s identification, like BEREZIN’s, seems to be based on a phonetic

jects this identification, suggests that *Ulus-Idi* may have been Ĵedei Noyan of the Mangqut, who according to Rašid-ad-Dīn was a commander of a thousand on the right wing.¹⁹

In fact, the *Ĵāmiʿ-at-Tawārīx* contains a great deal of information about Ĵedei Noyan. He is described in one place²⁰ as one of the oldest emirs and in the chapter on the Noyaqin, Urut and Mangqut is the subject of a detailed biography.²¹ His father had been murdered by his brothers for taking the part of Čingiz-Xan against the then all-powerful Taičiyut. The infant Ĵedei himself was carried off for safety to his mother's people, the Baryut, who on two occasions concealed him from his uncles when they came to seek and kill him. When the cause of Čingiz-Xan began to prosper the Baryut brought the child to him. He took him under his protection and treated him kindly. When Ĵedei grew up he became a great emir and was called Ĵedei Noyan. After the final defeat of the Taičiyut and their allies, the remnants of the Urut and Mangqut, although his own people, became Ĵedei's slaves; and in Rašid-ad-Dīn's day the Urut and Mangqut army were still the slaves of his descendants. Ĵedei was always in attendance on Čingiz-Xan; he was still alive in the reign of Ögedei, being then in the service of Princess Sorqoqtani and her children.

The *Secret History* provides us with further details regarding Ĵedei Noyan, who is referred to everywhere (except in one instance) as Ĵetei. He was, indeed, one of the oldest emirs. Together with his younger brother Doqolqu Čerbi²² (his half brother, apparently, since, according to Rašid-ad-Dīn, Ĵedei was an infant at the time of his father's death) he had been among the first to declare themselves for Temüjin after the latter's break with his *anda* Ĵamuqa (§ 120); and shortly afterwards, when

similarity with the second element of the compound. Ĵedei appears in BEREZIN as جدی (7.110, 210 and 251-253), جادای (15.191) and جده (7.98).

¹⁹ BEREZIN, 15.199.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 15.225.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 7.251-253.

²² According to Rašid-ad-Dīn (BEREZIN, 15.211), Doqolqu Čerbi belonged to the Arlat or Arulat people and was the brother of Borji Noyan (the Bo'orču of the *Secret History*); but cf. Paul PELLLOT and LOUIS HAMBIS, *Histoire des Campagnes de Gengis Khan*, I, pp. 352-3.

Temüjin had been proclaimed as Čingiz-Xan, he had at once appointed Ĵetei and his brother to the office of *qorči* (§ 124). Čingiz-Xan himself is made to relate how Ĵetei together with Ĵelme had rescued the five-year old Tolui when he was about to be murdered by a fugitive Tatar (§ 214). Ĵetei figures also in the list of commanders of a thousand appointed at the *quriltai* held in 1206 at the sources of the Onon (§ 202). And finally, in the distribution of the people amongst Čingiz-Xan's family, Ĵedei (as he is called in this one instance), together with Bala, falls to the lot of Tolui (§ 243).

Apart from Rašid-ad-Dīn's statement that Ĵedei was in constant attendance on Čingiz-Xan there is nothing in either authority to indicate that he actually took part in the campaign against the West, still less that he led the expedition down the Syr Darya, an expedition which in any case is passed over in complete silence in the *Secret History*.²³ The contemporary Moslem historians, as remarked by BARTHOLD, *op. cit.*, p. 39, are equally silent on this subject: it is only Ĵuvainī and Rašid-ad-Dīn who give an account of the expedition.

According to Ĵuvainī's account of the expedition, Uluš-Idi had been commanded by Čingiz-Xan to free the region of Ĵand "from the hands of enemies." He is "accompanied by emirs representing each of the sons"²⁴ and kinsmen, just as he too had delegated emirs and troops to represent him in the other armies." It is clear from these circumstances that Uluš-Idi must have been a prince of the blood. Approaching the town of Sīqnaq he sends on ahead one Ḥasan Ḥājjī²⁵ to call upon the inhabitants to surrender. They ignore the message and murder the messenger. Uluš-Idi is "enflamed with the fire of anger" and orders his troops

²³ It is briefly mentioned in the Chinese sources, the *Sheng-wu ch'in-cheng lu* and the *Yüan shih*, which state simply that Ĵoči attacked Yang-chi-han (Yangi-Kent), Pa-erh-chen (Barčīn) "and other towns." Cf. ERICH HAENISCH, "Die letzten Feldzüge Cinggis Han's und sein Tod," *Asia Major* 9 (1933) 527 and 530, and F. E. A. KRAUSE, *Cingis Han* (Heidelberg, 1922), p. 37.

²⁴ See note 3 above.

²⁵ Ḥasan Ḥājjī, as was already suggested by BARTHOLD, *op. cit.*, p. 414, is probably to be identified with Asan the Mohammedan trader, whom the Mongols encountered at Baljuna. Cf. the *Secret History*, § 182; also PELLIOU and HAMBIS, *Histoire des Campagnes de Gengis Khan*, I, pp. 46-47.

“to fight in relays from morn till night” until after seven days they take the town by storm. Finally the Mongols arrive in the neighbourhood of Ĵand, and this time Čin-Temür is sent forward as their emissary. He is at first in danger of suffering the same fate as Ḥasan Ḥājjī, but by the use of diplomacy he manages to come to some kind of understanding with the inhabitants. Returning to Uluš-Idi he relates his experiences and it is decided that the army, instead of resting at Qara-Qum,²⁶ as had been planned, shall first of all proceed to the capture of Ĵand. The town offers no active resistance, and upon its surrender Uluš-Idi continues on his way to Qara-Qum.

In Rašīd-ad-Dīn's version it is not Uluš-Idi alone but Ĵoči and Uluš-Idi who set out for Ĵand. It is Ĵoči who, on learning of Ḥasan Ḥājjī's death, orders the troops to fight continuously day and night in order to capture Sīqnaq. When Čin-Temür returns to Ĵand it is to report to Ĵoči and Uluš-Idi jointly; after the surrender of the town Uluš-Idi alone proceeds on his way to Qara-Qum.

Apart from the inclusion of Ĵoči in Rašīd-ad-Dīn's account of the campaign, the two versions agree exactly; there can be little doubt that Rašīd-ad-Dīn drew upon Ĵuvainī as his source. What, then, is the explanation of this one discrepancy? It arises, I suggest, from Rašīd-ad-Dīn's failure to recognize the identity of Uluš-Idi. He finds it stated in the previous chapter²⁷ of the *Ta'riḫ-i-Ĵahān-Gušā* that Čingiz-Xan had entrusted his eldest son, i. e., Ĵoči, with the conquest of Ĵand; and in a later chapter,²⁸ that Ĵoči had sent forces from Ĵand to assist in the operations against Urganĵ. On the other hand, in the actual chapter on the capture of Ĵand there is mention only of Uluš-Idi. The data appear to be conflicting and Rašīd-ad-Dīn attempts to harmonize

²⁶ The text has قراقورم, i. e., Qara-Qorum, but in II, 101, where it is described as “the place of residence” of the Qangli, Qazvini has adopted the reading of قراق, viz. قراق, and identified it with the Kara Kum desert to the north-east of the Sea of Aral (not to be confused with the other Kara Kum between Khiva and Merv).

²⁷ I, p. 64.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

them, as on another occasion,²⁹ by placing the two persons concerned in joint command. In fact the data are not conflicting, if the identity of Uluš-Idi is known, as presumably to Ĵuvainī it was. The Uluš-Idi who led this expedition must, as we have seen, have been a prince of the blood; it is clear from Ĵuvainī's previous and subsequent statements that the expedition was led by Joči; therefore Joči and Uluš-Idi are one and the same person, Uluš-Idi or Ulus-Idi being, as suggested above, a posthumous title like Uluγ-Noyan. It is a compound of the Turkish *uluš* or *ulus*, in either case in the sense of the Mongolian *ulus*, and *idi* "lord," "owner," the whole meaning "lord of the *ulus*," a suitable description of Joči, whether one thinks of him as the possessor of the first such "peuple-patrimoine" in the form of the forest peoples given him by Čingiz-Xan,³⁰ or as the ruler of the great *ulus* from which the Golden Horde was later evolved.

3. *Qa'an*

Joči's younger brother, Ögedei, is usually referred to in the *Ta'riḫ-i-Ĵahān-Guṣā* simply as *Qa'an* قاآن. In this Ĵuvainī seems to have followed the Mongolian usage. In the famous letter from Güyük to Innocent IV there is a reference to "Čingiz-Xan and *Qa'an*," where by *Qa'an*, as Paul PELLIOU has shown, must be meant Ögedei.³¹ That Ögedei should be referred to in this way in an official document written just under five years³² after his death makes it almost certain that *Qa'an* too was the kind of posthumous title which I suggest is exemplified in Uluγ-Noyan and Uluš-Idi. *Qa'an*, i. e., "the *qa'an par excellence*," was a particularly appropriate appellation if, as was the opinion of PELLIOU,³³ Ögedei was the first Mongolian ruler to bear this title.

²⁹ I. e., when he causes Bala and Dörbei to cross the Indus together in pursuit of Sultan Jalāl-ad-Dīn. Cf. my article, "*Iru and Maru in the Secret History of the Mongols*," *HJAS* 17 (1955) 403-410, page 408.

³⁰ Cf. VLADIMIRTSOV, *op. cit.*, pp. 126 and 130.

³¹ *Les Mongols et la Papauté*, [12] n. 1 and [19] n. 4.

³² Ögedei died on the 11th of December, 1241, and the letter to Innocent IV was written on the 11th of November, 1246. Cf. PELLIOU, *op. cit.*, p. [9].

³³ *Op. cit.*, p. [19] n. 4.

4. *Otegin*

Čingiz-Xan's youngest brother, Temüġe, is always referred to by Ĵuvainī as Otegin اوتکين,³⁴ i. e., *ot-tigin* "the lord of the fire," the term applied to the youngest son who remained at home and inherited the chief *ulus*.³⁵ Here again Ĵuvaini appears to have adopted the Mongolian practice. In the *Secret History* Temüġe is referred to only four times³⁶ by name: he appears everywhere else as Odčigin or Odčigin Noyan. This may be another example of the posthumous title, which is perhaps what Rašid-ad-Dīn means when he says (BEREZIN, 13.97) that Otči Noyan³⁷ had become Temüġe's "proper name" (*ism-i-alam*) by which he was best known (*šuhrat dārad*).

Conclusion

Soryaqtani, the chief wife of Tolui, appears in Ĵuvainī sometimes simply as Beki "the Princess" instead of the usual Sorqotani³⁸ Beki; and this is, perhaps, a further instance of such a title. It may be that other examples of this usage can be found in the Chinese and Mongolian sources. That the taboo itself was observed by the Mongols is clear from the independent testimony of Carpini and Rašid-ad-Dīn.³⁹ What is not so clear is how

³⁴ Otegin occurs also in Ĵuvainī (II, 125) as the name of the brother of Sultan 'Uṣmān, the last of the Qara-Khanid rulers of Samarqand.

³⁵ Cf. VLADIMIRTSOV, *op. cit.*, pp. 27 and 126.

³⁶ § 60 (Temüġe and Temüġe Odčigin), §§ 99 and 245 (Temüġe Odčigin).

³⁷ Or Otčīn Noyan.. Cf. also PELLLOT and HAMBIS, *Histoire des Campagnes de Gengis Khan*, I, pp. 175-6.

³⁸ Qazvini's text has سرقوتینی, i. e., سرقوتنی, in one place (II, 219) but everywhere else سرقوتی, i. e., سرقوتنی, for which there is MS. authority and which is also the reading of Barhebraeus. I see in this the feminine of a form *Sorqotu corresponding to the Sorqatu of the *Secret History* and the Sorqadu (alongside Sorqoqtu and Sorqaqtu) of Rašid-ad-Dīn. See PELLLOT and HAMBIS, *op. cit.*, 66-67 and 133. It is of course possible that سرقوتی, like سرقوتینی, is a corruption of سرقوتنی. Cf. also PELLLOT, "Le vrai nom de Serectan."

³⁹ Professor Vladimir MINORSKY has drawn my attention to two other references to this practice in Rašid-ad-Dīn. "There was another emir, Čaγatai the Little, and Čaγatai having died at that time his name was banned (*qorıγ šud*), and after that he

strictly they observed it and for what length of time. Two generations must pass away, according to Carpini, before the dead man's name might be mentioned. And yet Carpini, although ignorant of Tolui's name, had heard the names of all his three brothers, all of whom were dead at the time of his mission to Mongolia. Juvainī, for his part, refers to Tolui, Joči and Ögedei by what I suggest may be posthumous titles; but to Čayadai, their brother, he always refers by name. And finally Rašid-ad-Dīn, whilst asserting that the taboo on the word *tolī*, banned because of its resemblance to Tolui, was still in force in his own day, some seventy years after Tolui's death, makes no reference to a ban on the name Tolui itself. It is curious too that *tolī*, if the use of the word was really prohibited for so long a period, should still remain the ordinary word for "mirror" not only in Written Mongolian but also (in the form *tol'*) in the new official language. One's general impression is that the enforcement of these taboos was not very rigid or consistent; but the existence of such a practice, however laxly observed, provides a plausible, if not certain, explanation of the titles found in Juvainī.

was called Sönitei because he belonged to the Sönit people." (BEREZIN, 7.59). In the *History of the Nation of the Archers* (tr.) Robert P. BLAKE and Richard N. FRYE), p. 303, we read of "Sanit'ay, still another little Č'ayat'ay." In accordance with the information in Rašid-ad-Dīn the phrase "still another little Č'ayat'ay" would seem to stand in apposition to Sanit'ay and not to refer to a different person, as the punctuation of the Armenian original appears to indicate. (For the *Սանիթայ* of the text the Venice MS. has *Սոնիթայ* *Sonit'ay.) Rašid-ad-Dīn refers also to the case of Ögedei's fifth son, Qaşin, who died of alcoholism; the ban on his name necessitated the substitution of Tangqut for Qaşin as the name of the country. Cf. BEREZIN, 7.153, and BLOCHET, *op. cit.* p. 7.